

10/568192

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IN2004/000243

!AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 13 FEB 2006

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form.
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IN2004/000243

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 8

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 8 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
 - the written form ☐ has not been furnished
 - ☐ does not comply with the standard
 - the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished
 - ☐ does not comply with the standard
- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.
- ☐ See separate sheet for further details

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/N2004/000243

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-7
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-7
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-7
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IN2004/000243

Re Item III

In contrast with Rule 6.2(a) PCT claim 8 relies entirely on references to the drawings. As the claim has no technical features, the scope of the claim is not defined and for this reason this claim is not allowed.

Re Item V

Document D1: US 3 222 259 which is considered the most relevant state of the art discloses a liquid seal means comprising of:

a) a U-tube having one arm connected to the pipe collecting all the vented gas released from the plant and other arm connected to a liquid holder;

b) the top of the liquid holder connected to the pipe leading to the flare stack. The further features of claim I are new and the claim meets therefore the novelty requirement of Art. 33(2)PCT.

In the hydrocarbon plants, the gas presenting a safety hazard is collected from the entire area of the plant and burned. As this gas is very rich in hydrocarbon content, it is desirable that as much as possible of it to be recovered. However, while the gas at a relatively low pressure can be safely recovered, there is always a risk of the unexpected increase in pressure making the recovery process difficult and unsafe.

By the means of a non return valve placed in a conduit communicating between the lower portions of the liquid holder and the U-tube, the pressure in the pipe collector is continuously compared to the hydrostatic pressure of the column of liquid contained in the U-tube.

When a higher pressure in the pipe collector occurs, the movement of the liquid from the U-tube in the liquid holder creates a free access way between the collector pipe and flare pipe, and consequently the pressure in the pipe collector is maintained in safe range.

As the additionally features of claim 1 solve the posed problem and

these features are not suggested in any of the documents cited in the search report, it is considered that claim 1 satisfies the criterion set forth in Art. 33(3) PCT.

Re Item VII

The following formal matters are pointed out:

The independent claims are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT.

Prior art document D1 is not identified in disclosure as required by Rule 5.1(a)(ii).

The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses to increase the intelligibility of the claims (Rule 6.2(b) PCT). This applies to both the preamble and characterizing portion.